

## **REMARKS**

### **I. CLAIM AMENDMENTS**

The claims have been amended to clarify the previous amendment to the claims. The Examiner requested previously that the claims be amended to point out that the coating is on a substrate. The current amendment clarifies that it is the coating, not the substrate, that comprises the required composition. The claims also have been amended to specify that the claimed coating is the outermost coating on the substrate.

### **II. CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 35 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Okuda et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,183,869). Applicant respectfully disagrees. As amended, the claims of the present invention are directed to a substrate having a non-stick coating, wherein non-stick coating is the outermost coating and has the required composition. Okuda does not disclose the claimed outermost coating. Rather, Okuda is directed to primer compositions. The Examiner cited several compositions in Okuda that allegedly anticipate the claimed invention, but each of these compositions are used only to form a primer layer. Okuda teaches that it is necessary to apply another layer -- a "fluororesin layer" -- on top of the relied upon primer compositions in order to have a useful non-stick coating (Okuda, col. 20, line 20, et seq.) Nowhere does Okuda teach that the relied upon primer compositions may be used to form the outermost coating of a substrate. For this reason, Okuda does not anticipate claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 35 and 40. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this rejection.

### **III. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 6-8, 13 14, 35, 40, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuda. Claims 2-5, 9-12, 36-39, and 41-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103 (a) as being unpatentable over Okuda in view of Gebauer (U.S. Pat. No. 4,546,141). As discussed above, Okuda does not disclose, teach, or suggest a substrate having an outermost coat that is comprised of the required ingredients. In fact, Okuda teaches away from the claimed invention because it states that its primer compositions are not useful as outermost coatings. Specifically, when describing the preferred thickness of the outermost coating, Okuda teaches that if the outermost coating is too thin, then the outermost layer will wear away to expose the primer layer "*and the releasing properties are drastically reduced.*" (Okuda, col. 21, lines 24-27) (emphasis). In stating that the releasing properties are "drastically reduced" when the primer composition is exposed, Okuda teaches that its primer compositions would not be useful as an outermost layer.

Gebauer does not cure this shortcoming. Gebauer, like Okuda, is directed to a primer coating composition. Gebauer does not disclose, teach or suggest using any of its primer compositions as an outermost coating on a substrate. Gebauer and Okuda are directed to primer compositions, not outermost coatings. For this reason, the claimed invention is not obvious in view of Okuda or Okuda in combination with Gebauer. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this rejection.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is therefore requested. If there are any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4720.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MHR', is written over a horizontal line.

Mark H. Remus  
Registration No. 40,141

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. Box 10395  
Chicago, Illinois 60610  
(312) 321-4200

June 8, 2005